Rosenberg FOIA case; Ferlin affidavit: HW's followup of 1/25/76 memo on

While itx is not on this subject, reading the Ferlin affidavit to which I have (p. 15) and what I forget from the earlier case, to follow, suggest an added reason for the CIA's non-response to appeal and FBI's failure to acknowledge my request for the files on me: I'm not kidding when I say they can be of a magnitude indicated in the Rosenberg case, from those I know alone.

So, before I go further, pending my arranging for legal help or perhaps even if I do it would be a good idea if you can arrange for some tape transcribing. It will take one of two forms: regular cassettes or special ones that will fit a regular machine. A friend is exploring getting me one of the miniatures, like for short dictation or memo-making. If he doesn't, once I know you have the means of doing this securely I'll use a regular machine. I'm reluctant to use the fine Sony, as I'll explain, but think I have a mike somewhere I can use on the $40.00 Panasonic. Some time ago the instructions with a good tape recorder that had a remote-control mike said not to let it stay in the record mode too long turned off with the mike because it would flatten the rollers. So, while the Sony has a timer, when I can be interrupted for hours at a time, it is too easily for me to use it and run the risk of impairing it at all. I'm not going to try this today because Dave and Shirley will be here at some unannounced time and because I'm not sure you will want to do all of this kind of thing as we discussed. Does to burden your projected transcriber too much or in more than one way? Anyway and for the predictable future I won't be reading documents at my desk except in rare needs because it is ~~centre~~ centre-indicated. This seems a greater than usual clutter around where I sit. The mono machine would be ideal if adapted to a regular machine for transcribing. If not I have an xix extra good mike or two with an on-off switch that I can probably get wire to a plug that would fit the Panasonic.

Coming to the name of O. John Rogge reminds me of the number of files in which I can be (I knew him before and when he was chief of the DJ Criminal Division, but only slightly). and when Ferlin says they investigated him after he was criminal chief and they knew and worked with him and investigated him prior to confirmation - when he represented Government witnesses in this case- can there be any real limit to the investigations the FBI makes? Any investigation of Rogge would also lead back to one the FBI would consider "red" although he was a leading redbaiter of his time, Gardner Jackson. That certain led to me in dozens of ways.

The largest single number of Rosenberg files in the Bresson third affidavit is on Gregory Silvermaster (mentioned by Bentley). I knew his slightly, socially, in the mid-30s. I think because a roommate of his time, one I haven't seen or heard of since before World War II, worked for him. While going to graduate school nights, as I recall. I suppose because of this that roommate was the subject of an investigation that extended to his college a bit and one who also lived with us being called as a witness before some investigation and saying whatever was required to survive. I think that what I recall was ESAC. Anyway, does it not begin to spread into an enormity of nothingness? And do you think they now want either the fact or the meaninglessness public?

Ferlin affidavit: Paragraphs 15ff seem relevant to the earlier memo & vice versa, his observations support us. Want him as a witness? To this point he has observed and otherwise seems to have tumbled to some of what I noted earlier.

Here you phoned (JL) with the belief they are going to Pratt Ferlin on "substantial compliance." I agree after reading the rest of his affidavit. From Ferlin's own account I am even more convinced than when I spoke to you that the FBI has selected the high-risk cases like this and ours to run their risks on to amend the law in court. If they let the truth out they are bad off. If they run risks, the risks are lower because it they don't they are surely hurt. I think that while the Rosenberg case will get more attention becauseof its past, they are more hungup on ours because ours can hurt those now in the FBI. Like Frazier has to go. This further thinking impels me to urge greater consideration of the new approach I suggested in the earlier memo, on their technical

arguments.

Just as I finished reading the affidavit (not the motion) the witnesses came and when they left we went to bed. This is the next morning with my my reform I've only a few minutes before having to leave for blood-testing. So, I'll probably have forgotten much of what I noticed in reading the affidavit and thing under these conditions the most productive thing is to go into the political situation. Whether or not any judge is influenced by it we'll be wiser to assume the possibility at least. So,we want to put before that judge what can either help a judge wanting to be honest or deter anyone less than a Pratt and in any event make the best possible record.

The political situation of influence at the moment is the fact that the Congress is going to come as close as it dare to whitewashing the spook agencies. Judges may well read this as Congressional intent despite the FOIA law.

You and I have always concentrated on making a good record and I think in every case we have. We have always taken the initiative and in these cases we will. However, we can take initiatives other than we have. We face Green first. Therefore I think if we can't file prior to that hearing, formality that it will be, we should use it for initiatives. Like those pages from the List of Basic Source Materials to illustrate the stonewalling we have been facing. Maybe the Calhoun memo, which is already before her with the failure of the DJ to answer my letter documenting what is missing and us also asking for contempt motion if there is non-compliance, combined with a request for a chance to prove non-compliance with witnesses on both sides if there is not prompt delivery. If you thinkx this fits Green. I've confused it a bit with what belongs before Jones. With Green the record in other cases, the leaking of what has been denied so, the fact that every single case of these crimes over the years has been proven wrong once we pry the stuff loose. The two transcripts in particular with parts read.

5:20 p.m. I had just started to write you about another letter when you arrived. So I can dispense with that and try to pick up these threads. After a rough day.

I've gotten out my List of Basic Source Materials. I recommend giving Green the first three pages and begin by noting that it say "in possession of Commission as of February 1, 1964," long after there was any Commission. Pages two and 3, CDs 22-68, inc., are all of FBI origin and without exception are titled by subject, "Oswald, Internal Security, Russia."So are 11 of the 21 items on page 1. One of these 11 (CD12) merely adds "Ruba." Another, CD13a instead of "Oswald" substitutes "(Assaulting a Federal Officer)" Of the remaining 8 i tems, all but three are of FBI origin. One of these (CD14) is Details of telephone calls received re: Supports." Three are titled "Oswald" only. (CDs 5-7) (And what a story there is on CD 7 alone on this subject. Or 5.Any, in fact, and while it would take time to collect, they don't all deal with Oswald.) CD4 is "Ruby (3 volumes)". and CD1 is "Summary (5 volumes)."

This ought inform Green.

Then we pick up with what I've twice written Tyler, that they have provided no proof they have not complied, and despite my sending it certifiedn, no response. Then with my letter to Dresson saying their form letters don't even reflect any identification of the request to which they (do not) respond. Then an affidavit to which I attach sample from standard sources of how the scientific tests are recorded and interpreted, among whatever else you think should be included and a statement of what they have given me, like the only result of spectroscopy on the King clothing is Pb or lead. Then a couple of samples of proof of withholding in 75-226, where they requests the request earlier and then provided proof they were withholding what they had after the rewriting. And with the uncontested proof we told them included. What I'm really saying is that in this case we pick one maybe two key parts and hit hard and then make allegations on others, saying I know of other things they have and are withholding and fear that if I list them all they'll never admit having anything other than a itemize.One sample that may throw them is pictures of the scene of the crime. I can swear that I know of pictures they have, who took them, how they got them and can identify each picture with a film number. Believe me, I can. We might want samples of some but I think Green is overloaded on the Rosenberg

arguments.

Just as I finished reading the affidavit (not the motion) the witnesses came and when they left we went to bed. This is the next morning with my my reform I've only a few minutes before having to leave for blood-testing. So, I'll probably have forgotten much of what I noticed in reading the affidavit and thing under these conditions the most productive thing is to go into the political situation. Whether or not any judge is influenced by it we'll be wiser to assume the possibility at least. So,we want to put before that judge what can either help a judge wanting to be honest or deter anyone less than a Pratt and in any event make the best possible record.

The political situation of influence at the moment is the fact that the Congress is going to come as close as it dare to whitewashing the spook agencies. Judges may well read this as congressional intent despite the AA law.

You and I have always concentrated on making a good record and I think in every case we have. We have always taken the initiative and in these cases we will. However, we can take initiatives other than we have. We face Green first. Therefore I think if we can't file prior to that hearing, formality that it will be, we should use it for initiatives. Like those pages from the List of Basic Source Materials to illustrate the stonewalling we have been facing. Maybe the Calhoun memo, which is already before her with the failure of the DJ to answer my letter documenting what is missing and as also asking for contempt action if there is non-compliance, combined with a request for a chance to prove non-compliance with witnesses on both sides if there is not prompt delivery. If you thinkx this fits Green. I've confused it a bit with what belongs before Jones. With Green the record in other cases, the leaking of what has been denied me, the fact that every single case of these cases over the years has been proven wrong once we pries the stuff loose. The two transcripts in particular with parts read.

5;20 p.m. I had just started to write you about another matter when you called. So I can dispense with that and try to pick up these threads. After a rough day.

I've gotten out my List of Basic Source Materials. I recommend giving Green the first three pages and begin by noting that it say "In possession of Commission as of February 1, 1964," long after there was any Commission. Pages two and 3, CDs 22-68, inc., are all of FBI origin and without exception are titled by subject, "Oswald, Internal Security, Russia."So are 11 of the 21 items on Page 1. One of these 11 (CD12) merely adds "Cuba." Another, CD13a instead of "Oswald" substitutes "(Assaulting a Federal Officer)" Of the remaining 8 i tems, all but three are of FBI origin. One of these (CD14) is Details of telephone calls received re: Suspects." Three are titled "Oswald" only. (CDs 5-7) (And what a story there is on CD 7 alone on this subject. Or 5.Any, in fact, and while it would take time to collect, they don't all deal with Oswald.) CD4 is "Ruby (3 volumes)". And CD1 is "Summary (5 volumes)."

This ought inform Green.

Then we pick up with what I've twice written Tyler, that they have provided no proof they have not complied, and despite my sending it certified, no response. Then with my letter to Kresson saying their form letters don't even reflect any identification of the request to which they (do not) respond. Then an affidavit to which I attach sample from standard sources of how the scientific tests are recorded and interpreted, among whatever else you think should be included and a statement of what they have given me, like the only result of spectroscopy on the King clothing is Pb or lead. Then a couple of samples of proof of withholding in 75-226, where they requests the request earlier and then provided proof they were withholding what they had after the rewriting. And with the unconested proof we told them included. What I's really saying is that in this case we pick one maybe two key parts and hit hard and then make allegations on others, saying I know of other things they have and are withholding and fear that if I list them all they'll never admit having anything other than 4 itemine.One examplexthat may throw them is pictures of the scene of the crime. I can swear that I know of pictures they have, who took them, how they got them and can identify each picture with a file number. Believe me, I can. We might want samples of some but I think Green is overloaded on the Rosenberg

No, I never knew or met Remington. Or Kistler, Sobell, the Rosenbergs, etc. But I once had a boss who had met Bentley. He was really persecuted, around the world, especially in Mexico. He went to Cuba and didn't like it. Teaching again and has published an anti-Castro book.

But this is from one of those uncounted and countless thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of documents. And I'd forgotten about all of this.

They'll not have a file on the Republican from high-school days who was one of us. But I got him the job that was to be his lifetime career, with a Republican friend of mine in a Republican state and to hold that he'd probably have said anything. Especially after I offer a low opinion of a manuscript on a black Reconstruction Senator from Mississippi, probably his one daring adventure into liberalism.

My God! It will take a mortgage on my house to pay for their filesson me! I think we'll want to consider a different approach of which this will be part: suing them for damages with what they did with that horrendous stuff. Aside from many other factors, just think what it cost me when I was farming and like wanted to buy my chickens after Hamie tested them at the Dulles' and the Secret Service investigated me and the FBI fed them all that kind of poison. The agent, by the way, was one Griffith. He came on a Saturday afternoon when I went up to the house to meet his covered with a mixture of manure from carpentry and chickenshit and Lil had made one of her then typical jokes, maybe about McCarthy. (He wrote both of us funnail, though and sent a co-agent to see the day after he was renominated in San Francisco- the guy who later wrote the book. He invited us to the White House but separately, during the campaign, but when we were told that we were to be photographed with him - this didn't bug either of us - and then come out and say we were going to vote for him (NIXON?) we both declined, separately. He was his didn't consult the FBI on Jewish-farm voters. Women's, too.

Back to the cryptic notes. I have one asking about in camera inspection in the 226 appeal and 1448 and 1996 on what Calhoun calls "foot-dragging" and I stonewalling, for all the internal memos like Calhoun's. Can we use the Calhoun memo to amend the appeal? Do we want to? Do we want to use it to ask the court to ask for them? Can we? Can it?

Where did I go wrong in the past year? How could I have survived not much of which this memo is minor a part without ever being hospitalized for illness (by the Army, of course, as the one exception), or never otherwise ever being unable to get out of bed, and now have this pair of illnesses? Have I suddenly started sleeping and company?

Worry, worry-

Head for the high ground! Lil thought I should relax with Archie Punker. And who is the Robert Oatr? Jack Gilford, who I also knew a little before McCarthy. When he did work for a real Communist.